

1 attorneys as well during that period. I do
2 not believe there was ever a time when the
3 relationship ended. There may have been a
4 time when there wasn't anything going on.

5 BY MR. COLE:

6 Q So when you moved from Schnader
7 Harrison over to Sidley in 1990, am I correct
8 that Mr. Parker's and his various matters
9 came with you?

10 A I'm not sure that they all did or
11 that they all did at once, but I believe as a
12 general statement that would be true.

13 Q You mentioned earlier that you
14 thought there may have been times during the
15 approximate tinier period of '83 to '93 when
16 Mr. Parker may have been represented by other
17 communications counsel; do you recall that
18 testimony?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Do you remember who those other
21 communications counsel were?

22 A No.

1 Q During the course of your
2 representation of Mr. Parker, did you
3 yourself personally communicate directly with
4 him?

5 A Ever?

6 Q Yes.

7 A Yes.

8 Q How often, about?

9 A I have no idea. As needed.

10 Q As needed?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Do you recall whether that occurred
13 in person or by telephone or by
14 correspondence?

15 A All three.

16 Q Do you recall who initiated those
17 communications normally? Was it you? Was it
18 Mr. Parker?

19 A I don't recall. In the course the
20 attorney-client relationship, I'm sure he
21 sometimes initiated it and I sometimes
22 initiated it.

1 Q To avoid the cumbersome reference
2 to the decade of 1983 to 1983, can we
3 understand right now that when I say during
4 the course of your representation I'm
5 referring to the '83 to '93 period? Is that
6 acceptable to you, just as a matter of
7 shorthand?

8 A Yes.

9 Q During the course of your
10 representation of Mr. Parker, to your
11 knowledge did other attorneys at the firm
12 with which you were associated also provide
13 legal services to Mr. Parker and his
14 entities?

15 A Certainly.

16 Q That include Mr. William Andrle?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Mr. Beizer?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Craig Blately?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Kevin Clark?

BETA REPORTING

(202) 638-2400

1-800-522-2382

(703) 684-2382

C/C

1 A Yes.

2 Q Paula Freidman?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Those are all other attorneys; is
5 that correct? Each of the individuals I
6 named is an attorney?

7 A Yes.

8 Q What was your relationship with
9 Mr. Andrle? Did you supervise him? Did he
10 supervise you?

11 A Well, he was an associate, and I
12 was a partner.

13 Q That says it. Did he work for you?
14 Did he work under you?

15 A Well, for most of the time I was
16 not actually the billing partner for
17 Mr. Parker and his entities. So I don't
18 quite not how to answer the question.

19 Q Who was the billing partner,
20 Mr. Beizer?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Did Mr. Beizer join you at Sidley

1 involved some tricky issues about coverage,
2 because various applicants proposed to locate
3 on different peaks, but I really don't
4 remember anything about the proceeding.

5 BY MR. COLE:

6 Q Do you recall that you or your firm
7 represented Mr. Parker in connection with a
8 transfer of control application for a
9 television station in San Francisco in 1989?

10 A A transfer of control?

11 MR. COLE: Let me just pass the
12 witness and Mr. Geolot and Mr. Hutton and the
13 reporter a document which is one page in
14 length.

15 Why don't we mark this as Wadlow
16 No. 2 which is a letter on a letterhead of
17 Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis dated
18 March 2, 1989, signed by William Andrle for
19 Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis which
20 purports to be a transmittal letter for a
21 transfer of control application relative to
22 KWBB TV in San Francisco.

BETA REPORTING

(202) 638-2400

1-800-522-2382

(703) 684-2382

012

1 (Wadlow Deposition Exhibit No. 2
2 was marked for identification.)

3 BY MR. COLE:

4 Q Does that refresh your recollection
5 at all about representation to Mr. Parker?

6 A Well, I remember the entity West
7 Coast United Broadcasting. I do not remember
8 this transaction in 1989.

9 Q Was that entity a Parker entity;
10 that is, was Mr. Parker a principal entity,
11 as best as you can recall?

12 MR. GEOLOT: That entity being West
13 Coast?

14 MR. COLE: West Coast Broadcasting,
15 yes.

16 MR. HUTTON: Before or after this
17 application?

18 MR. COLE: Let's see if he can
19 recall.

20 THE WITNESS: West Coast was an
21 applicant for one of the Faith Center
22 stations, the one in San Francisco, but I

1 believe -- and it was the prevailing party in
2 a comparative hearing, but I believe that was
3 well before 1989.

4 Parker at the time of the
5 application, as I recall, was a stockholder.
6 As I also recall, at some point some
7 stockholders bought out some other
8 stockholders, and I believe Parker was one of
9 those who was bought out. I can't recall
10 when that was.

11 But I also recall sometime in
12 the '90s West Coast was sold to somebody
13 else. I don't remember a transfer of control
14 in 1989.

15 BY MR. COLE:

16 Q Fair enough. But you generally
17 recall representing West Coast Broadcasting
18 at approximately this time period; am I
19 understanding your testimony correctly?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Whether or not it's in a particular
22 connection with that transaction, it's

BETA REPORTING

(202) 638-2400

1-800-522-2382

(703) 684-2382

C14

1 reflected in the letter of Wadlow No. 2?

2 MR. GEOLLOT: You're asking whether
3 he personally or the firm?

4 BY MR. COLE:

5 Q I'll take you personally. Do you
6 have any recollection of that?

7 A I don't have any recollection of
8 the transaction that seems to be reflected by
9 this letter.

10 Q Did you personally represent West
11 Coast Broadcasting?

12 A Again, in the '80s this would have
13 been a Beizer client. I believe when West
14 Coast was subsequently sold sometime in the
15 mid '90s, I had primarily responsibility.

16 Q Fair enough. Do you recall whether
17 you represented Mr. Parker in connection with
18 the preparation of a low power television
19 station application for Channel 68 in Los
20 Angeles in 1989?

21 A I don't recall that.

22 Q I'm not going to mark this. I'm

BETA REPORTING

(202) 638-2400

1-800-522-2382

(703) 684-2382

C15

1 A Yes. I believe there is some
2 agreement on the division of the cost.

3 Q Is that also why you sent a copy of
4 the bill to Mr. Parker?

5 A Yes, or I believe so.

6 (Wadlow Deposition Exhibit
7 No. 16 was marked for
8 identification.)

9 BY MR. COLE:

10 Q Now, I focus your attention,
11 Mr. Wadlow, on this document which is a
12 letter dated February 18, 1991, which we'll
13 mark as Wadlow No. 16.

14 It's a two-paged letter on Sidley &
15 Austin letterhead dated February 18, 1991,
16 addressed to Michael L. Parker over your
17 name. It's Bates stamped 0082 and 0083. Is
18 that your signature on page 2?

19 A It appears to be.

20 MR. COLE: Let's go off the record.
21 The phone is ringing.

22 (Discussion off the record)

1 MR. COLE: Back on.

2 BY MR. COLE:

3 Q Mr. Wadlow, did you identify your
4 signature on this?

5 A It appears to be mine, yes.

6 Q Did you write this letter?

7 A I don't specifically recall writing
8 the letter. I have only a vague recollection
9 of it.

10 Q What is your vague recollection of
11 it?

12 A I recall Mr. Parker asking me, I
13 believe, by telephone for a letter that he
14 needed to show to some third party, and for
15 some reason, I believe, there was a third
16 party up in Reading, but I don't recall who
17 it was or what his purpose was. I recall he
18 needed it quickly, but that's really all I
19 can recall sitting here today about the
20 letter.

21 (Wadlow Deposition Exhibit

22 No. 17 was marked for

1 identification.)

2 BY MR. COLE:

3 Q Let me show you a document which
4 Mr. Geolot provided to us in discovery which
5 is, I believe, and you can correct me if I am
6 wrong, a document which reflects your time
7 entries for the Reading Broadcasting account
8 on February 18, 1991. We'll mark that as
9 Wadlow No. 17.

10 A I see that.

11 Q Does that conform to your
12 recollection?

13 A It's consistent with my
14 recollection that there was a brief telephone
15 conference or a telephone call I believe from
16 Mr. Parker and that I drafted a letter in
17 response to his request.

18 Q Do you know if anybody else helped
19 you write this letter that you recall?

20 A I really don't recall any of the
21 circumstances now. I assume I did not type
22 it myself.

BETA REPORTING

(202) 638-2400

1-800-522-2382

(703) 684-2382

C18

1 where you state "It is our opinion that the
2 Administrative Law Judge simply concluded
3 that SBBLP had failed to report your
4 activities and involvements with SBBLP which
5 the ALJ found to be such as to make a real
6 party-in-interest. However, the ALJ did not
7 find that you had done anything improper or
8 that anything you had done reflected
9 adversely on you."

10 That was your opinion; is that
11 correct?

12 A It would appear to be.

13 Q That opinion, according to this
14 letter at least, was based on your review of
15 the decision and on your general familiarity
16 with the facts and the issues involved. Am I
17 reading that correctly?

18 A It does not specifically state
19 that, but I think that's a reasonable
20 inference.

21 Q You also indicate that you were
22 counsel to a competing applicant in the San

1 Bernardino proceeding. Was your general
2 familiarity with the facts and issues in the
3 San Bernardino proceeding derived from the
4 fact that you were counsel to a competing
5 applicant or from some other source or from a
6 combination of the two?

7 MR. GEOLOT: Objection to the form.

8 BY MR. COLE:

9 Q Let me rephrase the question. Was
10 your general familiarity which you refer to
11 in the last sentence of paragraph 2 based on
12 the fact that you had been counsel to a
13 competing applicant in the San Bernardino
14 proceeding?

15 A That is probably what I meant by
16 that language, yes.

17 Q Can you recall any other source of
18 information about the San Bernardino
19 proceeding which might also have contributed
20 to your general familiarity referenced in the
21 second paragraph.

22 MR. HUTTON: Just for

1 clarification, other than his reviewing the
2 opinion which he said he did before?

3 MR. COLE: Yes. I read the
4 sentence as "we have reviewed the decision
5 and are generally familiar with the facts and
6 issues involved," and so yes, I understand
7 that he's reviewed the decision. I
8 understand he was also counsel to a competing
9 applicant.

10 BY MR. COLE:

11 Q Is there any other source that
12 would have contributed to the best of your
13 recollection to your general familiarity
14 referenced in this paragraph?

15 A Not that I'm aware of, no.

16 (Wadlow Deposition Exhibit
17 No. 18 was marked for
18 identification.)

19 BY MR. COLE:

20 Q Let me show you this. I'm handing
21 to Mr. Wadlow and identifying it as Wadlow
22 No. 18 an expert from a set of Findings of

1 You should feel free obviously,
2 Mr. Wadlow, to peruse this to your heart's
3 content. I'm particularly interested in,
4 among other things, Page 174, paragraph 309.

5 Let me ask you, do you recall that
6 Schnader Harrison represented Inlet Empire
7 Television in this proceeding?

8 A I do.

9 Q Is this the competing applicant
10 that you referred to in your
11 February 18, 1991 letter to Mr. Parker?

12 A It is.

13 MR. GEOLOT: Can we go off the
14 record for a minute?

15 MR. COLE: Sure.

16 (Discussion off the record)

17 MR. GEOLOT: The document that's
18 been provided provides and includes two
19 signatures on the document, one at Page 176
20 by Nixon Hargrave and another on Page 186 by
21 Schnader Harrison.

22 Without the entire document, it is

1 conclusions with respect to the SBBLP
2 disqualification?

3 A Well, it changed the
4 disqualification into a denial in approving
5 the settlement.

6 Q The review board, obviously the
7 decision was speak for itself, confirmed the
8 judge's opinion; do you agree with that?

9 MR. HUTTON: I object to that
10 characterization. If you want to show him a
11 document and get testimony on the document,
12 but you're not qualified to testify on behalf
13 of anyone.

14 BY MR. COLE:

15 Q Why did you not refer to the review
16 board decision in your February 18, 1991
17 letter?

18 A I really don't have a specific
19 recollection as to what was in my mind at the
20 time I wrote the letter. I can speculate
21 that I concluded that because of its
22 subsequent action in approving this

1 settlement and denying rather than dismissing
2 has disqualified the application; that the
3 review board effectively mooted the negative
4 statements about Parker, but I really don't
5 have a specific recollection.

6 Q In any event you didn't say that in
7 your letter, did you?

8 A No, I didn't.

9 Q Would you agree with me that the
10 sentence that says that the ALJ did not find
11 that you had done anything improper or that
12 anything would have been reflected adversely
13 on you is completely inaccurate unless there
14 was some reversal by the review board?

15 MR. GEOLOT: Objection.
16 Mischaracterizes the letter. We're asking
17 now for his view of what happened in 1991?

18 MR. COLE: I'm asking whether or
19 not his view as he sits there right now is
20 that this letter as it is written with no
21 reference to the review board could be deemed
22 an accurate assessments of the ALJ's decision

1 public interest, convenience and necessity.

2 The Commission is unable to make this
3 determination because of the questions it has
4 concerning whether the application is really
5 controlled by you or by Dr. W. Eugene Schoot
6 and/or organizations he controls." Isn't
7 that the gist of this letter?

8 A I believe it is, yes.

9 Q So would you agree with me that
10 this letter was triggered by questions
11 concerning potential real party-in-interest
12 misconduct?

13 MR. HUTTON: I'm going to object.
14 It doesn't say that.

15 MR. GEOLLOT: Objection.

16 MR. COLE: I'm asking for
17 Mr. Wadlow who is an expert in communications
18 law having practiced in the area for 25 years
19 to give me his reading of those two
20 sentences.

21 MR. GEOLLOT: I object and direct
22 him not to answer that question on the basis

1 written, did you ever give Mr. Parker any
2 advice that is contrary to what is stated in
3 that letter?

4 A No.

5 Q I'd like you to refer now to Wadlow
6 Exhibit No. 10.

7 A I have No. 10 in front of me.

8 Q I'd like you to refer to page 8 of
9 the application which is section 2 of the
10 transferee's legal qualifications,
11 question 7, and 7 consists of subparts (a)
12 through (e).

13 Then under (e), if you answer yes
14 to any of those questions, it calls for four
15 specific items of information in an exhibit.
16 (a) is answered yes. To your knowledge, was
17 that a correct answer?

18 A To my knowledge, yes.

19 Q (b) is answered yes. To your
20 knowledge, was that a correct answer?

21 A To my knowledge, yes.

22 Q (c) is answered no. To your

1 knowledge, is that a correct answer?

2 A Yes, to my knowledge that's
3 correct.

4 Q (d) is answered no. To your
5 knowledge, is that a correct answer?

6 A To my knowledge, that's correct.

7 Q (e) refers to Exhibit No. 3. To
8 your knowledge, does Exhibit No. 3 provide
9 the information enumerated in Items 1
10 through 4 in that application?

11 A To my knowledge, yes.

12 Q I'm referring to Exhibit No. 3 and
13 particularly to the two narrative paragraphs
14 on page 2 of Exhibit No. 3. Can you tell me,
15 to your knowledge, if those narrative
16 paragraphs are correct?

17 A Are you referring to the one that
18 begins with "Mr. Parker was also an officer
19 and director and shareholder of Mt. Baker?

20 Q Yes.

21 MR. COLE: Objection. Are you
22 asking him this question for the purposes of

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

-----X
In re Applications of :
: :
: :
READING BROADCASTING, : MM Docket No. 99-153
INCORPORATED, : File No. BRCT-94047KF
: File No. BPCT-940630KG
ADAMS COMMUNICATIONS :
CORPORATION. :
-----X

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, April 4, 2000

Deposition of

PAULA G. FRIEDMAN

a witness, called for examination by counsel
for Adams Communications Corporation (ACC)
pursuant to notice and agreement of counsel,
beginning at approximately 10:08 a.m., at the
law offices of Sidley & Austin, 1722 Eye
Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., before Shari
R. Broussard of Beta Reporting & Videography
Services, notary public in and for the
District of Columbia, when were present on
behalf of the respective parties:

BETA

Nationwide Court Reporting & Videography Services
1000 628-2400

(703) 684-BETA

DI

1 again, let us know. We're happy to
2 accommodate you in that regard.

3 Also I should say we have by
4 speaker phone Mr. James Shook, counsel for
5 the Enforcement Bureau. Mr. Shook, can you
6 hear us all right?

7 MR. SHOOK: I can hear you just
8 fine.

9 BY MR. COLE:

10 Q With that having been said,
11 Ms. Friedman, are you an attorney?

12 A Yes, sir.

13 Q Could you please describe your
14 professional background just generally
15 starting with law school?

16 A I graduated law school in 1989.
17 Went to Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis after
18 I graduated. Came to Sidley & Austin in
19 April of 1990. Began work at the Federal
20 Communications Bar Association in February
21 of '94, worked for both Sidley & Austin and
22 the FCBA for a few years. Left Sidley &

BETA REPORTING

(202) 638-2400

1-800-522-2382

(703) 684-2382

D2

1 Austin in September of 1995 and left the FCBA
2 in July of 1999.

3 Q So during the period of time from
4 approximately February of '94 to September
5 of '95 you were a practicing attorney with
6 Sidley and working in some capacity with the
7 FCBA as well?

8 A Correct.

9 Q What was your position at the FCBA?

10 A I was the executive director.

11 Q Are you practicing now?

12 A No.

13 Q You started work at Schnader
14 Harrison in '89 upon graduation from law
15 school?

16 A Yes.

17 Q From 1989, when you started with
18 Schnader Harrison, through your tenure at
19 Sidley, did you specialize in any particular
20 area of legal practice?

21 A In communications law.

22 Q Could you briefly describe what

1 your communications practice involved?

2 A It mainly involved representing
3 radio and television station group owners for
4 the FCC.

5 Q During the period of time from 1989
6 through September of 1995, and let's for the
7 purpose of this deposition refer to that as
8 your communications practice because that
9 encompasses the Schnader Harrison years and
10 your Sidley & Austin years. During your
11 communications practice did you have occasion
12 to represent Mr. Michael Parker?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Did you also represent
15 organizations in which Mr. Parker was a
16 principal?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Again, for purposes of our
19 deposition, just to streamline things, if I
20 refer to Mr. Parker, I'm also referring to
21 Mr. Parker and organizations in which he was
22 a principal. Is that fair enough?